

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, 26-37 and 39-42 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action dated October 30, 2007, claims 1-3, 5-6, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, 26-37 and 39-42 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

Summary of Interview

Applicants thank Examiners Pitaro and Luu for their time in conducting a telephone interview on January 16, 2008. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representatives Jennifer Bush and Carlo Ocampo and Examiners Pitaro and Luu discussed the cited Balabanovic reference and the rejection of the limitation of claim 1 reciting "finding a corresponding one of the plurality of different visual notations that matches the audio input." The Examiner agreed, for the reasons further detailed below, that the amendments presented herein would overcome the current rejection.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the first paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 26-37, and 39-42, under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099552 ("Rubin"), in view of "A Survey of Web Annotation Systems" ("Heck"), U.S. Patent No. 5,857,099 ("Mitchell"), and "Multimedia Chronicles for Business Communications" ("Balabanovic"). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “finding a corresponding one of the plurality of different visual notations that matches content of the audio input.” Claim 26 has similarly been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “finding a corresponding one of a plurality of different visual notations that matches content of the audio input.”

Similarly, claims 35 and 40 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, finding a corresponding annotation object(s) “comprising one of a plurality of different visual notations, the plurality of different visual notations referencing a close match to content of the audio input.”

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to finding a corresponding one of a plurality of different visual notations such as a graphic representation or a text translation of the content of the audio input and provides direct annotation of images with the found plurality of different visual notations.

As noted in the Office Action by the Examiner in reference to claims 1 and 9, Rubin, Heck, and Mitchell all fail to disclose or suggest “finding a corresponding one of the plurality of different visual notations that matches content of the audio input.” Balabanovic does not remedy the deficiencies of Rubin, Heck, and Mitchell.

As noted by the Examiner during the Examiner Interview, Balabanovic also does not disclose or suggest “finding a corresponding one of the plurality of different visual notations that **matches content of the audio input** (emphasis added).” The Examiner argues that the icons in Figure 5 of Balabanovic depicting various faces represent the claimed “plurality of different visual notations.” However, these icons merely represent the person associated with the audio input. Balabanovic simply finds icons that correspond to the person dictating the audio input, but the icon does not match the content of the audio input, as claimed. Thus,

Balabanovic, alone or in the combination recited by the Examiner, does not disclose or suggest “finding a corresponding one of the plurality of different visual notations that matches content of the audio input.”

Amended claims 26, 35, and 40 include similar limitations as claims 1 and 9. Thus all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 9 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 26, 35, and 40.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1, 9, 26, 35, and 40 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

The claims not specifically mentioned above variously depend from claims 1, 9, 26, 35, and 40, which were shown above to be patentable over Rubin, Heck, Mitchell, and Balabanovic either alone or in combination. Additionally, these claims recite additional patentable features not shown in the cited references. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that these claims also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, 26-37, and 39-42, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
GREGORY J. WOLFF, et al.

Date: January 29, 2008

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No: 50,784
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200